



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

chasing power, with gold coin; and that failure of such bimetallism now means either entire disuse of silver, as money, or its exclusive use therefor—a change to the silver standard of values. There may be those of the debtor class who would welcome such a change. Even to them the general result would be loss rather than gain; and it certainly could not profit silver producers, for in that event silver, as a purchasing medium, would inevitably sink to its own commercial level, and the value of silver money would be only that of so much of the white metal in the merchants' scales.

If for naught but pure selfishness, all interests should wish to anchor the business of this country to assured gold specie payments and absolute good faith, and thereby draw to us the capital of the world, with its best brains and brawn, which then would regard our favored land as the most promising of all for their employment, and whose industries and enterprises would fructify all of our business interests.

Again, from the outcome, would we learn, with reinvigorated faith in proverbial wisdom, that "Honesty is the best policy."

PLINY T. SEXTON.

A WOMAN'S VIEW OF CHRISTIANITY'S MILLSTONE.

PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH, in his article on "Christianity's Millstone," has placed in a very deliberate manner a most plausible and powerful argument in the hands of Christianity's opponents. He claims that the Old Testament, which has been considered the very bulwark of Christianity, must be laid aside, because the book as a whole can not be proven to be historically correct. Christianity embraces many grades and shades of belief, from Catholicism with its doctrine of Immaculate Conception, transubstantiation, Papal infallibility, confession and absolution to Unitarianism, which denies the divinity of Christ and the resurrection of his body, and is not shackled by what Matthew Arnold calls the "fairy tales" of the Christian Religion. Yet taking Professor Smith's paper as a basis of my argument, I can show that from any Christian point of view the New Testament is bound to fall the moment the Old Testament,—the rock upon which it was built—is taken away.

The Catholics and many Protestant sects believe and point to the Gospel as their authority—that Christ came in fulfillment of the prophecies in the Old Testament, but Mr. Smith says: "No real and specific prediction of the advent of Jesus or of any event in his life can be produced from the books of the Old Testament." This has always been the contention of those who refused to accept Jesus as the Messiah! Yet, in order to try to prove that he *was* the Messiah, the New Testament states (St. Matthew, Chap. i.) that Jesus was descended from the House of David, through *Joseph*, who, it was claimed, was *not* his father, and this notwithstanding that he was God and born of a Virgin! Christianity bases its claims to recognition either on the fulfillment of the prophecies or on its code of ethics. The first claim, according to many scholars—including Professor Smith—has no *raison d'être*, and since Jesus preached wholly from the Old Testament, and his precepts and principles were derived entirely from the Bible and the sayings of the Sages, which were later compiled in the Talmud, the second claim cannot be one of superiority. Even the Sermon on the Mount, which is considered the cream of the Christian spirit, was proven years ago by the Rev. Dr. Zipser to be drawn from these sources and to contain no new sentiments. The myths

and fairy tales which are Christianity's true *millstones* come from the Buddhist legends which were carried into Palestine by the Essenes and others, and were made use of by the Evangelists to adorn the Gospel narrative. A brief survey and comparison of the similarity of their leading features will prove this :

Immaculate Conception of Maya,
mother of Buddha.

Vision of Suddhodana, father of Buddha, in which it is announced to him that the Queen, his wife, shall conceive miraculously.

Buddha at his birth was adored by the gods and the great Kings of the four cardinal points.

Buddha discoursed with the Rishis.

Buddha was tempted by the demon Mara.

Buddha was baptized in the Nairanjana.

The incident of the Chandala woman at the well.

The Courtesan Ambapali.

The traitor Devadatta.

The triumphal entry of Buddha into Rajagriha.

Adoration of the Rice Cake.

Immaculate Conception of Mary,
mother of Jesus.

Vision of Joseph (supposed) father of Jesus in which it is announced Mary, his wife, shall conceive miraculously.

Jesus at his birth was adored and received homage from the Magi.

Jesus discoursed with the doctors in the temple.

Jesus was tempted by the demon Satan.

Jesus was baptized in the Jordan.

The incident of the Samaritan woman at the well.

The Courtesan Magdalena.

The traitor Judas.

The triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem.

Adoration of the Eucharist.

Mr. Smith says : "It is a rule of criticism that we cannot by any critical alembic extract materials for history out of fable. If the details of a story are fabulous, so is the whole. If the details of Abraham's story are plainly unhistorical, the whole story must be relegated to the domain of tribal fancy."* The whole story of the birth and life of Jesus should therefore according to Mr. Smith, "be relegated to the domain of fancy," and no longer be "allowed to cloud the vision of free inquiry"—is it less difficult to believe that a son was born to a virgin than that a son was born to Sarah when she was ninety years of age?

Professor Smith states that the Old Testament is the entire body of Hebrew literature, philosophy, history and poetry and as such he objects to binding it as a single book and objects still more strenuously to binding it to the New Testament. Instead of seeing any objections to binding the history and theology of a people in one book, I consider it an admirable method, and would suggest that the Christian Church collect and bind together with the New Testament the record of the persecutions, massacres and wars carried on under its banner during the past eighteen hundred years, as exemplifying Jesus's mission: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth. I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father and the daughter against her mother and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law." (St. Matthew x., 34-35.) Why Jesus should be termed the Prince of Peace, after such a statement, is beyond my comprehension! Mr. Smith maintains that

* That Abraham did live, however, and that the Biblical account of some of the events in his life are true is proven by Mr. Pinche's recent Assyrian Archæological discoveries.

Judaism did not rise higher than "tribal monotheism," but the Psalms abound with the sentiment that the Lord God of Israel is the Lord who reigns over all the earth, and Moses proclaimed Jehovah to be the God of the spirit of all flesh. Mr Smith claims that "Christianity is the denial of Jewish tribalism, proclaiming that all nations have been made of one blood to dwell together on the earth, and are sharers alike in the care of Providence." Yet in St. Mark, Chap. xvi. we find, "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, but he that believeth not *shall be damned.*" And in order to carry out these teachings the history of The Inquisition with the massacre of three hundred thousand souls is written in flame and the story of the crusades painted in blood !

To show that Jesus merely preached Judaism, notwithstanding the perversions of the disciples and of the church, let me give Jesus's own testimony when he was asked which was the greatest commandment (Matthew xxii.). He quoted Deuteronomy, vi., and Leviticus, xix. The first of these commandments is the most important of all the Jewish prayers, is said daily by observant Jews and at the bedside of the dying. The Jews—who do not believe that conversion, whether obtained by exhortation, execration, or social excommunication, is necessary for the salvation of their neighbor's souls—follow the second command more faithfully than those who call themselves Christ's followers, typified by such representatives as the Czar of Russia, head of the Greek Church, Mr. Pobiedonostseff, procurator of the Holy Synod, Pope Leo XIII. (avowed enemy of his neighbor at the Quirinal) on through the gamut to Drumont and Rector Ahlwardt, the anti-Semites, enemies of what Professor Smith calls the "financial Jew."

"Of a belief in the immortality of the soul," continues Mr. Smith, "no evidence can be found in the Old Testament." Yet Mr. Bethune English—a Christian divine who became a convert to Judaism claims that in Daniel xii., 2, Isaiah xvi. and Ezekiel xxxvii. are found plainer accounts of a resurrection than were ever preached by Jesus. Furthermore, the New Testament itself represents the resurrection of the dead being perfectly well known to the Jews and describes Jesus himself as proving it to the Sadducees out of the Old Testament !

"It is but useless and it is but paltering with the truth," pursues Mr. Smith, "to set up the figment of a semi-inspiration. An inspiration which errs, which contradicts itself, which dictates manifest incredibilities, such as the stopping of the sun, Balaam's speaking ass, Elisha's avenging bears, or the transformation of Nebuchadnezzar, is no inspiration at all."* In replying to this I would like to assert my Yankee prerogative by asking why these miracles are any more difficult to believe than those cited in the New Testament? There we read that Jesus fed four thousand people with seven loaves, that he walked on the surface of the waters, that the Holy Ghost descended on him in the bodily shape of a dove and a voice was heard from heaven, proclaiming: "Thou art my beloved son; in thee I am well pleased." It is also related that he turned water to wine, healed lepers by touching them and raised the dead, and after he was crucified, he ascended to heaven in bodily form ! If Christians accept these statements as truths, they need have no scruples about accepting all the statements in the Old Testament as

* Many modern minds regard the story of the sun standing still as poetical, and certain ancient Hebrew Sages of repute hold that the episode of Balaam's ass speaking was a vision of Balaam.

well! If, however, they agree with Matthew Arnold in believing they are justified in discarding as untrustworthy all the reports of miracles and if they believe, as he points out, that the disciples misunderstood and distorted in many instances what Jesus really said, then to quote Mr. Smith's words in regard to the Old Testament: "The time has surely come when as a supernatural revelation, the *New Testament* should be frankly, though reverently laid aside, and no more allowed to cloud the vision of free inquiry." Thus disposed of, the *New Testament*—laid aside as a book of supernatural revelation, its miracles proven to spring from Buddhist legend, its central idea (the redemption of mankind) not fulfilled—can rest only on its moral and ethical teachings which are proven to be all gleaned from the Old Testament and the teachings of the Hebrew Sages. Therefore, I appeal to the candid reader to decide if what is, after all, the true foundation and spirit of Christianity, can be justly called its Millstone.

MAUD NATHAN.

NEW YORK'S OPPORTUNITY FOR 1900.

THE century that is approaching its close is the most important one in the world's history. Why should not its close be marked with record and thanks? Why should not that celebration take the obvious and gratifying shape of a world's fair? Why should not the place of that fair be the city of New York?

There is no doubt in the minds of all who saw the Columbian exhibition that Chicago gave a better fair to the world than New York would have prepared in the same time, had both of the cities built and exhibited in competition. Chicago is the more active and adventurous of the two, the more liberal and the more indigenous—this must be conceded even by those who dislike the smoke, noise, crowd, and scenic ugliness of the city by the lake.

But Chicago has had her fair. She has compelled the astonishment, the respect, the admiration of the world. Now, let New York make good her promises and show us a thing of equal magnificence and beauty. There would be a fitness in this division of honors. Chicago is American; New York is cosmopolite. It was proper that the quadri-centennial of the discovery of this continent should be observed in a city that is peculiarly a native growth. The city itself is an achievement, an exhibit of purely American courage, energy and taste. It has no history; it has accepted less from older nations than any other of our important towns.

New York, on the contrary, is a complex development. It was Dutch, English and American before it became Irish, and there are hopeful indications that in a little while it will become American again, or at least German. As the gate of incoming population, its own citizenry has become more diverse than that of any other commercial capital in the world; it is more Irish than Dublin, more Hebrew than Jerusalem, nearly as German as Berlin, and the French, Italians, Spaniards, Scandinavians, Japanese, Poles, Hungarians, Russians, Chinese, negroes, even Syrians and Turks are in such numbers as to give racial character to their quarters, which are extensive enough to constitute towns in themselves. There is an obvious fitness in choosing such a city as the seat of an exposition designed to mark an era of progress that concerns America not more than the whole world, especially as it is more available to the world beyond the sea than Chicago was.

A proposition has been made to hold a great religious festival at the end